

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated November 28, 2007. Claims 2-7, 9-12 and 16-30 are pending.

Claim 2 stands rejected under Section 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over JP 09-050019 in view of Sobue (US 6,143,450). JP '019 allegedly discloses a parallax barrier 6 on a glass substrate 1, but does not disclose or suggest making an alignment mark with the parallax barrier. Recognizing this flaw in JP '019, the Office Action apparently cites to the alignment mark 3 in the BM of Sobue and contends that it would have been obvious to have used such an alignment mark in JP '019. This Section 103(a) rejection is incorrect and is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 2 requires: “(c) forming a first layer, which satisfies a prescribed positional relationship with the parallax barrier layer, on the second principal surface of the first substrate; and wherein the step (b) includes a step of making a first alignment mark, wherein the alignment mark is formed in the parallax barrier, and step (c) comprises using the alignment mark in the parallax barrier in forming the first layer.”

While JP '019 allegedly discloses a parallax barrier 6, the reference does not disclose or suggest making an alignment mark in the parallax barrier as called for in claim 2. Moreover, Sobue merely discloses making an alignment mark with a BM provided immediately adjacent a color filter layer 6. Thus, anyone arguably trying to combine the alignment mark of Sobue with JP '019 would have provided an alignment mark in JP '019 on the *rear* side of the substrate 1 along with the BM 4 – the way that Sobue teaches. However, this would *not* result in the invention of claim 2 because the alignment mark would be on the opposite side of the substrate compared to that called for in claim 2. Moreover, the cited art also fails to disclose or suggest

making an alignment mark in a parallax barrier, and using the alignment mark in the parallax barrier in forming the first layer, as called for in claim 2.

There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in the cited art, or otherwise, of making an alignment mark in the parallax barrier as called for in claim 2. Instead, the cited art teaches away from claim 2 by expressly teaching to form the alignment mark with the BM which would result in the alignment mark being on the rear side of the substrate 1 in modified JP '019 where the BM 4 is located.

The Office Action dated November 28, 2007 contends on page 5 that the claim “only recites that the step of providing a parallax barrier includes the step of making a first alignment mark . . . it does not in any way specify where that alignment mark is formed.” In this filing, it has been clarified that the alignment mark is in the parallax barrier (see language of claim 2 above). Moreover, the language of claim 2 requires that the alignment mark be formed in the step of providing the parallax barrier, and thus be formed in the parallax barrier. In any event, the clarification change to claim 2 addresses and renders moot this argument in the Office Action.


For the above reasons, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 2 is incorrect and should be withdrawn. All claims are in condition for allowance. If any minor matter remains to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with regard to the same.

IMAI et al
Appl. No. 10/522,601

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____



Joseph A. Rhoa
Reg. No. 37,515

JAR:caj
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100